

Mr. Alan Mitchell  
Power Plant Siting Manager  
Minnesota Environmental Quality Board  
300 Centennial Building  
658 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Comments on Proposed Amendments to  
Minn. R. ch. 4410

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has completed a final review of the proposed rule amendments to the Rules Relating to Environmental Review of Electric Power Generating Plants and High Voltage Transmission Lines in Proceedings Before the Public Utilities Commission, found at Minn. R. 4410.7010 to 4410.7500. The MPCA sent initial comments in a letter dated September 13, 2002. This letter provides final comments and suggestions related to energy generation facilities.

In our initial comments provided back in September, MPCA staff proposed a list of environmental impacts and information that we felt would be needed from a project proposer in order to complete an environmental report. Again, most of the information in our list is required in the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) current rules for a Certificate of Need. Thus, the information required should be familiar to project proposers.

In the interim, the Faribault Energy Park Environmental Report was filed with the PUC and was delegated to the Energy Division of the Minnesota Department of Commerce for their review. Reviewing the Faribault Environmental Report gave us the opportunity to see how the draft rules might work to provide the necessary information to agencies and the public to make informed decisions.

With one exception, the rules as proposed look fine. My staff has suggested that it may be useful for the Environmental Quality Board to specify in the rule the specific units to be used in reporting facility air emissions in Environmental Review documents. We suggest that the rule specify that emissions be reported in pounds or tons per years and, for purposes of comparisons across alternatives of different plant sizes, pounds per kilowatt-hour generated. We would propose the following language changes to the draft rules (our additions to the proposed rules are underlined, deletions struck through):

Subpart 2: **Impacts of Power Plants**

- A. the anticipated emissions of the following pollutants expressed as an annual amount of the emissions at the maximum rated capacity of the project and as an amount (pounds or tons) produced per kilowatt hour and the calculations performed to determine the emissions: sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide, mercury, and direct emissions of particulate matter, including particulate matter under 2.5 microns in ~~length~~ diameter and emissions of secondary formation of particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter.
- B. the anticipated emissions of any hazardous air pollutants ~~or~~ and volatile organic compounds
- C. (no changes)

In addition, the rules should also contain a discussion about the anticipated contribution of the project to ozone precursors as well as ground level ozone itself. Reactive organic gases (ROG's) are those precursors. ROG's are a common unit elsewhere in the country and should not be a burdensome addition to the topics of an environmental report.

- D. the anticipated contribution of the project to the formation of ozone expressed as reactive organics gases. Reactive organics are organics that are considered precursors necessary for the formation of ground level ozone

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rules. I, or members of my staff, would be happy to discuss any of these comments with you. I can be reached at (651) 296-7305.

Sincerely,

Sheryl A. Corrigan  
Commissioner

SAC:mbo